DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 287 CE 042 735

TITLE	Development of Criteria to Measure the Extent of Implementation and the Effectiveness of Demonstrations in Vocational Education. Case Study Plan.
INSTITUTION	Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	15 Apr 79
CONTRACT	300-78-0574
NOTE	70p.; For related documents, see CE 042 733-738.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; Criteria; *Demonstration Programs; Educational Improvement; Educational Innovation; Educational Research; *Evaluation Methods; *Guides; Information Dissemination; Planning; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Research and Development; *Research Methodology; Research Utilization; Standards; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Impact

ABSTRACT

This document presents the plan for the conduct of eight case studies of federally and state-administered demonstration projects to assess the usefulness and practicality of a monograph discussing the improvement and measurement of the impact of vocational education demonstration projects. An introduction discusses the background and purpose of the project which is intended to measure the effectiveness and implementation of vocational education demonstration projects. Section II sets forth the plan for the conduct of the case studies, the basic goals of which will be to assess (1) whether the criteria, documentation, and standards specified in the monograph as acceptable evidence of project impact are practical, feasible, and do predict success and (2) whether the roles and accomplishments of planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators that were specified in the monograph do actually lead to improved impact. Major study questions are listed, the sample is defined, data sources are discussed, and the instruments proposed to collect the required data are described. Section III briefly discusses use of case study data. Extensive appendixes include the monograph outline, case study report outline, and instrumentation (Project Information Form, Third-Party Evaluator Interview Guide, Project Monitor Interview Guide, and Interview Guide for Adapting Organizations). (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262287

DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA TO MEASURE THE EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DEMONSTRATIONS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Case Study Plan

Submitted to:

BUREAU OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Washington, D.C.

USOE Contract No. 300-78-0574

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CE 042 735

Submitted by:

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.
2924 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Virginia 22204

April 15, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. Background	1
	B. Purpose of Contract	2
	C. Contract Products	3
II.	PLAN FOR CONDUCT OF CASE STUDIES	4
	A. Major Study Questions	4
	B. Sample	5
	C. Data Sources	7
	D. Instrumentation	7
III.	USE OF CASE STUDY DATA	10

APPENDICES

A: Monograph Outline

B: Case Study Report Outline

C: Instrumentation

- Project Information Form
- Third-Party Evaluator Interview Guide
- Project Monitor Interview Guide
- Interview Guide for Adapting Organizations

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Studies conducted by the General Accounting Office* and a committee of the National Academy of Sciences** have concluded that vocational education demonstration projects funded by the U.S. Office of Education have not had documented, widespread impact. Because of these and other findings, significant additions to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 were incorporated into the Education Amendments of 1976. While sustaining the long-standing legislative commitment to further research and development in vocational education, the amendments include a sharpened demand for specific, identifiable benefits to result from R and D expenditures. Indeed, at several points the new legislation requires that grants and contracts be made only when the applicant demonstrates a reasonable probability that improved products or practices will result which will be used in a substantial number of classrooms or other learning situations within five years after the termination date of the federal grant award.

Federal support for research and development in vocational education may be traced to the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and the George-Barden Act of 1946. The major initiatives, however, were begun in the 1960's. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 explicitly provided substantial funding for research and development, and the amount of resources and scope of activity was expanded with the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

Although research projects have been supported through several sections of the Act, demonstration projects have been almost entirely undertaken under Part D of the 1968 Amendments (which were further amended by the Education Amendments of 1976). Historically, funds for these demonstration projects were divided between federally-administered and state-administered projects, with the amount of funding available per state determined on a formula basis. On the federally-administered side, three-year grants have been awarded to a small number of projects in each state to demonstrate career education. On the other hand, the states differed widely in the use of their funds, with some having made relatively large grants to support one or two demonstration projects while others made numerous smaller grants. In addition, the state-administered projects have included vocational education as well as career education.

*General Accounting Office. Career Education: Status and Needed Improvements. Washington, D.C. General Accounting Office, Division of Manpower and Welfare, 1976.

**National Academy of Science's Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development. Assessing Vocational Education Research and Development. 1976.

Since the inception of the demonstration program effort, USOE has been concerned with the evaluation and diffusion of project results. Each year the federally-administered projects have been required to submit written evaluation reports and funds have been allocated for this effort. A national evaluation of the program was conducted* and a handbook was developed to assist project directors with evaluations of their individual projects.* Similarly, there has been federal support for studies regarding the diffusion of vocational education innovations, with some efforts examining the issue of change and continuation at host sites, and others focusing on the extent to which products and practices are known by and used at secondary organizations or replication sites.** While each of these studies have been important, there still remains, however, the basic conclusion reached by GAO and NAS, and the mandate contained in the new amendments to the Vocational Education Act.

B. Purpose of Contract

In response to the conclusion reached by the General Accounting Office and the National Academy of Science and to the legislative mandate, this study was funded by the U.S. Office of Education to develop criteria to measure the effectiveness and the implementation of vocational education demonstration projects. More specifically, the study has the following objectives:

- To define and specify what will be considered interim and final acceptable evidence that a demonstration project has resulted in improved teaching techniques or curriculum materials that have been used in a substantial number of classrooms or other learning situations within five years after termination of the grant or contract; (interim acceptable evidence is that evidence which should be expected during the last phase of external federal support and final acceptable acceptable evidence is that evidence which should be expected within the five years after the termination of federal support);

- To generate and recommend criteria for the review of demonstration project applications which are predictive of the ability of the applicant to achieve the interim and final acceptable evidence specified in response to the above objective;

*Development Associates, Inc. Evaluation and Educational Decision-Making: A Functional Guide to Evaluating Career Education. September 1975.

**Hull, W.L., and Bina, J.V. The Influence of Selected Organizational and Administrative Variables on Continued and Extended Use of Exemplary Projects in Vocational Education. Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University 1977.

- To produce a monograph for improving and measuring the impact of vocational education demonstration projects, for use by program planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators; and

- To diffuse the products of this project to appropriate curriculum coordination centers, state department of education personnel (including RCU directors), and local education agency personnel (including local directors of federally-administered vocational education demonstration projects) through the preparation of the monograph and the conduct of training workshops.

C. Contract Products

In achieving the above objectives, a monograph for improving and measuring impact will be developed which will discuss the criteria, documentation, and standards which have been specified as defining acceptable evidence of the impact of vocational education demonstration projects; the monograph will also discuss required roles and accomplishments of project planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators in achieving success and improved impact as measured by the parameters of acceptable evidence. In preparing the monograph, a literature review was conducted to establish the state of the art in measuring what have been considered successfully-implemented and documented demonstration projects.* In addition, a panel of experts from various constituency groups in the field of vocational education was established to review and provide impact to each study product. As a further check on the validity of the monograph and its chapters, eight demonstration projects were selected on which case studies will be prepared in order to assess the usefulness and practicality of the monograph.

The purpose of the case studies will be to assess whether successful projects have collected or, if not, could collect the types of data specified in our system for documenting acceptable evidence of project impact and have achieved the standards set for each criterion; and to determine whether the projects have implemented the procedures which the monograph states lead to success, and to determine whether these procedures do actually lead to success. A document containing the case studies will be prepared and, based on this, the monograph will be revised as necessary to reflect the experiences of the case study projects.

*Development Associates, Inc. Literature Review for Development of Criteria To Measure the Impact Of Vocational Education Demonstration Projects. February 12, 1979

II. PLAN FOR CONDUCT OF CASE STUDIES

A. Major Study Questions

The primary output of this project will be a monograph discussing the improvement and the measurement of the impact of vocational education demonstration projects. An outline of the monograph is shown in Appendix A. As can be seen, the monograph will present recommendations for criteria, documentation and standards which we have proposed as interim and final acceptable evidence of project impact. The monograph will then discuss required roles and accomplishments of project planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators in achieving improved impact. As specified in the contracted Scope of Work, eight case studies of federally-and state-administered demonstration projects are to be conducted in order to assess the usefulness and practicality of the monograph. These case studies are to be conducted for the specific purpose of supporting the development of the monograph, and not for the purpose of documenting detailed project descriptions or histories. Each case study will provide a general description of the project and will discuss the data which were actually collected to evaluate the project in relation to the data which are recommended for collection as part of interim and final evidence. In addition, the case studies will discuss the actual roles and accomplishments of the planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators in achieving success and the relationships of these to the roles and accomplishments specified in the monograph. The basic goals of the Case Studies then, will be to assess whether the criteria, documentation, and standards specified in the monograph as acceptable evidence of project impact are practical, feasible, and do predict success; and whether the roles and accomplishments of planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators which were specified in the monograph do actually lead to improved impact. Appendix B contains an outline of the Case Studies.

In order to respond to the case study goals, a series of major study questions was developed. These questions are as follows:

Measurement of Impact

1. What criteria were used to evaluate the impact or success of the project?

2. What data or documentation were collected?

3. What evaluation methodology was used?

4. What standards were set for judging impact or success?

5. What were the findings?

6. How are above criteria, documentation, and standards related to the criteria, documentation, and standards proposed in the monograph?

7. For the data not collected, why weren't they collected? How could the data be collected? What findings may be expected?

8. What are the implications for the monograph?

Improvement of Impact

1. Who was involved in the planning phase, the implementation phase, and the demonstration/dissemination phase?

2. What was accomplished during each phase that particularly led to success or improved impact?

3. What was each person's role and responsibilities with respect to the accomplishments?

4. What aspects of the planning, implementation, and demonstration/dissemination phases were particularly successful?

5. How were actual roles, responsibilities, and accomplishments related to those discussed in the monograph?

6. What are the implications for the monograph?

B. Sample

To assess the usefulness and practicality of the monograph, case studies will be prepared on eight projects. Four of the projects are those which are federally-administered and four are those which are administered by the states. Of the federally-administered projects, two are still receiving federal funds while two have completed the federal funding phase. A similar breakdown is used for the state-administered projects. A table showing this distribution is presented below.

	Administered By	
	USOE	States
Still Receiving Federal Funding	2	2
Federal Funding Phase Completed	2	2

In selecting the case study projects, USOE staff and state Research Coordinating Unit (RCU) Directors were asked to nominate those projects which were successful in meeting their objectives. For the completed projects, nominations were sought of projects which had positive primary outcomes (student outcomes, teacher outcomes, etc.), had met their dissemination objectives, were continuing at the demonstration site, and whose products were adapted by other school districts or schools. For projects still receiving federal funding, nominations were sought of projects which had, at least, positive primary outcomes. Overall, 25 projects were nominated by USOE staff and six randomly selected RCU Directors.

From the nominated projects, eight were finally chosen. These eight were selected in order to include both USOE-and state-administered projects, projects at different stages of completion, projects from different parts of the country, and projects of various substantive types. These projects are:

Federally-Administered: Operational

- Demonstration of NIE's Experienced-Based Career Education Program
  Portland, Connecticut

- Experienced-Based Career Education Program in Cooperative Vocational Education and Work Experience
  Norman, Oklahoma

Federally-Administered: Completed

- Wayne Design for Career Education
  Wayne, New Jersey

- Career Ladder Infusion Model Building
  Garden Grove, California

State-Administered: Operational

- Experienced-Based Career Education for Mentally Disabled Students
  Fort Dodge, Iowa

- Solar Energy in the Building Trades
  Falmouth, Maine

State-Administered: Completed

- FACIT: Florida's Approach to Competency-Based Individual Teaching
  Tallahassee, Florida

- Preferred Learning Styles of Vocational Education Students
  Appleton, Wisconsin

The eight projects were contacted by telephone in early February and all agreed to participate. Initial visits were made during the weeks of February 26 and March 5 to brief the project directors and their staffs on the monograph and case study plans, to collect their proposals, reports and appropriate documents, and to collect other preliminary information.

C. Data Sources

Project proposals, and reports, evaluation plans and reports, dissemination materials, the original grant application instructions and proposal review criteria and other existing documents and records will be obtained and used to record data regarding project history, experience, and impact. In this matter, the time and effort of the project directors and their staff in collecting these data will be minimized. Beyond this, the project director or another knowledgeable staff member will be interviewed to obtain the specific evaluation and process data not available from existing reports and other documents that are needed to assess the usefulness of the monograph. All in all, each piece of information will be collected from one individual at each of the eight projects. For example, the evaluation data not available from reports or from staff personnel will be obtained from the third-party evaluator. A separate interview with the evaluator will then be held to collect additional data on reactions to and the feasibility of collecting the proposed documentation for interim and final evidence and information on contributions to project success. The project monitors at the SEA and USOE will also be interviewed to obtain data on their roles and the roles of their organizations in the planning and implementation of the projects. In this case also, we expect to interview only one monitor for each project or eight individuals altogether. Using these data collection strategies, we will minimize the response burden of all concerned and reduce duplication of effort as much as possible.

Finally, a sample of adapting organizations will be contacted in person or by phone, depending on their location. We propose to collect information from a maximum of five adapting organizations per project. This maximum number may not be reached at all eight projects, however, since some projects will have just been completing the federal funding period, and will not have reached the point at which their products have been adapted widely. Therefore, not all of the projects may be able to cite five organizations as being possible adapters. In any case, a maximum sample size of five adapters for each of the eight projects (for a possible total of 40) will provide sufficient information for our purposes and also keep the response burden to a reasonable level.

D. Instrumentation

Based on the major study questions and the data sources which were identified, the following instruments are proposed to collect the required data:

1. Project Information Form

This instrument will be the major source of data for validating the usefulness and practicality of the monograph. It will collect information on:

- project background, objectives, services and operations;
- evaluation data collected and their relationship to the proposed interim and final acceptable evidence of project impact; and
- roles and accomplishments of planners, implementors, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators that were related to project success.

Project reports and other documents will be used to supply basic information called for by the Project Information Form. Information not available from these sources will be obtained through an interview with the Project Director or other individuals identified as having the most knowledge of the particular area of inquiry.

2. Third-Party Evaluator Interview Guide

This instrument will collect data on:

- limitations placed on evaluation due to constraints imposed by the project, LEA, SEA, USOE, or others;
- reactions to and feasibility of collecting documentation for interim and final acceptable evidence of project impact; and
- roles and accomplishments which led to project success.

The third-party evaluator for each project will be interviewed to obtain these data.

3. Project Monitor Interview Guide

This instrument will be used to collect information on:

- contributions of the monitors to the success of the project;
- roles and accomplishments of the monitors which led to the institutionalization and spread of the project; and
- characteristics of the project which led to success.

One individual from the monitoring organization (SEA or USOE) for each project will be interviewed to obtain the above data.

4. Interview Guide for Adapting Organizations

This instrument will be used to collect information on the process by which the adapting organization learned about the demonstration product, how the decision was made to adapt the product, the extent of implementation of the product, and the impact on its target audience. Data will be collected from five adapting sites for each of the eight demonstration projects included in this effort. To the extent possible, interviews will be held in person; however, in cases where travel is significant, interviews will be conducted by telephone.

The complete instruments may be found in Appendix C.

III. USE OF CASE STUDY DATA

The specific purpose of the case study data will be to assess the usefulness and practicality of the monograph being developed to improve and measure the impact of vocational education demonstration projects. (See Appendix A for the outline of the monograph). Based on these data, the monograph will be adjusted and revised as appropriate so that it is practical and effective for use with the various types of demonstration projects which may be funded.

In order to assess the usefulness and practicality of the draft monograph and to structure the revision process, case studies of the eight projects will be prepared, each case study will provide a general description of the project; present the documentation of interim and final evidence which were collected; discuss the documentation which were not collected and its appropriateness or unappropriateness for the project; and discuss the roles and accomplishments of planners, implementors, evaluators, monitors and disseminators during the planning, implementation, and demonstration/dissemination phases in achieving success and improved impact. The outline for the case study report is presented in Appendix B of this document. The case studies are not being prepared to provide a history or description of each project to serve as a separate product of our effort. Rather, they are supportive documents, prepared to aid the monograph development effort by showing that the criteria, standards, and documentation proposed for interim and final acceptable evidence are valid indicators of successful projects and by showing that the roles and accomplishments of planners, implementors, evaluators, monitors and disseminators that are proposed for the improvement of project impact are, in fact, important factors leading to project success, and are feasible and practical to implement.

In developing each individual case study, no statistical analysis of data is planned since the data to be collected will be descriptive in nature and will be presented in a narrative form. Similarly, in revising the monograph, the experiences obtained with the eight case study projects and the eight case studies themselves will all be utilized; however, no statistical data analysis techniques will be utilized. This is due to the fact that not only are the data not quantitative in nature, but that the data will not be summarized in any fashion. Each case study will be examined individually to assess any implications for the monograph. Then, if some aspects of the monograph are not supported by the case study experience, changes in the monograph will be considered or alternative methods will be proposed to handle special cases.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Monograph Outline

APPENDIX B: Case Study Report Outline

APPENDIX C: Instrumentation

APPENDIX A

MONOGRAPH OUTLINE

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background Information on USOE Demonstration Program
B. Need for Monograph (previous evaluation studies citing lack of demonstrated impact; Congressional mandate)
C. Purpose (Objectives; intended audience; possible uses)
D. Strategy for Development of Monograph (literature review; panel review; validation by development of case studies)
E. Organization of the Monograph

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR IMPROVING AND MEASURING IMPACT

A. Stages of project planning, implementation, demonstration/ dissemination (definitions and brief descriptive introduction)
B. Interim and final acceptable evidence (definitions; time frame)

III. MEASURING THE IMPACT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

A. Interim Acceptable Evidence

1. Demonstration Impact

a. Criterion
b. Documentation
c. Standard
d. Practical Examples

2. Dissemination

a. Criterion
b. Documentation
c. Standard
d. Practical Examples

3. Efforts Toward Institutionalization

a. Criterion
b. Documentation
c. Standard
d. Practical Examples

B. Final Acceptable Evidence

1. Utilization

   a. Criterion
   b. Documentation
   c. Standard
   d. Practical Examples

2. Long-term Impact

   a. Criterion
   b. Documentation
   c. Standard
   d. Practical Examples

3. Continuation/Adaption Impact

   a. Criterion
   b. Documentation
   c. Standard
   d. Practical Examples

IV. IMPROVING THE IMPACT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

A. Introduction to Developmental Stages and Roles of Project Personnel

B. Planning Phase

Roles and accomplishments of planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and documentators in each of the following areas:

- Stating project objectives in clearly defined and measurable terms
- Stating the expected impact of the project on the target population as a primary objective
- Specifying required activities for accomplishing each objective
- Specifying timelines for the implementation of activities and achievement of project milestones.
- Allowing for adequate time and effort for planning and sufficient time for start-up
- Identifying a project director who has management capabilities as well as subject matter expertise

- Developing a staffing plan which includes job descriptions, responsiblities, and required qualifications for each position
- Planning for adequate support and training of project staff, teachers, and other appropriate personnel
- Planning to include teachers and others who will be affected by the program in the development of project products and materials
- Developing a recordkeeping plan including designing project forms for internal and external use
- Developing a plan for keeping cost data by: (1) per pupil and total activity costs; (2) direct and indirect costs; and (3) fixed/variable costs
- Stating dissemination as a project objective
- Developing a dissemination plan
- Developing a formative evaluation plan as a management tool
- Planning for the formative evaluation to be conducted by a third-party
- Developing an outcome/impact evaluation plan
- Planning for the outcome/impact evaluation to be conducted by a third-party
- Planning for program longevity or institutionalization
- Planning for program transportability (i.e., flexibility for adaption in other settings)

C. Implementation Phase

Roles and accomplishments of planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators in each of the following areas:

- changes in project objectives
- staffing and management
- staff training
- project operations or services
- recordkeeping

- fiscal matters
- formative evaluation
- outcome/impact evaluation
- working towards program longevity or institutionalization
- dissemination plan

D. Demonstration/Dissemination Phase

Roles and accomplishments of planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators in the implementation of the dissemination plan.

E. Alternative Timing Options for Planning, Implementation, and Demonstration/Dissemination Phases

V. CONCLUSION

Need for adequate planning, implementing, monitoring, evaluating, and dissemination to improve impact. Relationships among the stages and relationship to interim and final acceptable evidence.

APPENDIX B

CASE STUDY REPORT OUTLINE

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Brief description of study; relation of the document to other study products.

B. Purpose

Purpose of the case studies is to assess whether successful projects have collected the types of documentation of impact specified in interim and final acceptable evidence, and, if not, how they could go about collecting this documentation; also to determine whether the projects implemented the procedures which the monograph says lead to success and, if not, why they did not and what they did do; also to determine if the procedures which we say lead to success actually do lead to success.

C. Case Study Strategy

How projects were selected; list of projects.

II. IMPLICATIONS FOR MONOGRAPH FROM CASE STUDY FINDINGS

Discussion of support for monograph and changes needed based on case study findings.

III-X. INDIVIDUAL CASE STUDIES

A. General Description

1. Project background
2. Objectives
3. Project Services
4. Dissemination Activities
5. Adaptions

B. Evidence of Impact

Documentation of interim and final evidence. If some documentation was not collected, how could it have been collected? Are there alternative indicators of success? What are they?

C. Project Operations

1. Planning Phase

Roles and accomplishments of planners, implementers, evaluators, monitors, and disseminators in achieving success and improved impact; relationship of these roles and accomplishments to roles and accomplishments discussed in monograph.
Are roles and accomplishments discussed in monograph effective in improving impact? Are other procedures more effective?

2. Implementation Phase

Roles and accomplishments of planners, implementers, evaluators, monitors, and disseminators in achieving success and improved impact; relationship of these roles and accomplishments to roles and accomplishments discussed in monograph.
Are roles and accomplishments discussed in monograph effective in improving impact? Are other procedures more effective?

3. Demonstration/Dissemination Phase

Roles and accomplishments of planners, implementers, evaluators, monitors, and disseminators in achieving success and improved impact; relationship of these roles and accomplishments to roles and accomplishments discussed in monograph.
Are roles and accomplishements discussed in monograph effective in improving impact? Are other procedures more effective?

D. Conclusions: Implications for Monograph

APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENTATION

- Project Information Form
- Third-Party Evaluator Interview Guide
- Project Monitor Interview Guide
- Interview Guide for Adapting Organizations

PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

PROJECT _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

_____

TELEPHONE NUMBER (___) _____

PROJECT DIRECTOR _____

DATE(S) OF DATA COLLECTION _____

INTERVIEWER _____

SECTION A. PROJECT BACKGROUND

A1. Who is/was the project grantee? _____

A2. Is/was the project administered directly by the USOE or through the State?

☐ USOE ☐ State

A3. When did federal funding begin? _____

A4. When does/did federal funding terminate? _____

A5. What are/were the major goals of the project?

A6. In what type of school or institutional setting is/was the project located?

A7. What is/was the population to be served?

A8. Briefly describe the project services.

A9. Describe the organization of the project staff. (Obtain an organizational chart and job descriptions for each project position.)

SECTION B. INTERIM ACCEPTABLE EVIDENCE

B1. Is the outcome/impact of the program being evaluated in terms of its influence on the target population?

_____ Yes, evaluation has been completed. (Answer questions in Block A.)

_____ Yes, evaluation is currently taking place or is in the planning stage. (Answer questions in Block B.)

_____ No, and there are no plans for evaluation. (Answer questions in Block C.)

BLOCK A

(a) What criteria were used to evaluate the outcome/impact of the program on the target population?

(b) Were any standards set to judge the success of the program in terms of its impact on the target population?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, what were they?

If not, why not? Could there have been? Explain.

BLOCK A continues .....

BLOCK A (con't)

(c) Briefly describe the evaluation methodology or plan.

1. What data were collected and by whom?

2. Were pre-/post-test measures used?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, explain.

If not, why not? Could there have been? Explain.

3. Was a comparison group used?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, explain.

BLOCK A continues .....

BLOCK A (con't)

If not, why not? Could there have been? Explain.

(d) What were the findings?

BLOCK B

(a) What criteria are being or will be used to evaluate the outcome/impact of the program on the target population?

(b) Are any standards being set to judge the success of the program in terms of its impact on the target population?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, what are they?

If not, why not? Could there be? Explain.

(c) Briefly describe the evaluation methodology or plan.

1. What data are being or will be collected and by whom?

2. Are or will pre-/post-test measures be used?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, explain.

BLOCK B continues.....

BLOCK B (con't)

If not, why not? Could there be? If so, how?

3. Is or will a comparison group be used?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, explain.

If not, why not? Could there be? Explain.

BLOCK C

(a) Why isn't the program being evaluated? Is funding a problem?

(b) Is evaluation feasible? (Explore the possibilities with the respondent in terms of meeting the criteria set forth in the monograph by asking the following questions):

1. What criteria could be used to evaluation the outcome/impact of the program on the target population?

2. What standards of success could be set?

3. What evaluation methodology could be used? What data should be collected? Who could collect these data?

Could pre-/post-test measures and comparison groups be used?

B2. Were records kept for possible follow-up of both project participants and members of the comparison group (if applicable), e.g. names, addresses, phone numbers, test scores?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, what records were kept and in what format? Are the records available for follow-up? How long are the records kept?

If not, what not?

B3. For each dissemination strategy utilized, were records of individuals and organizations kept for possible follow-up regarding adaption of the program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, what records were kept and in what format? Are the records available for follow-up?How long are the records kept?

If not, why not?

B4. For each strategy used indicate the number of organizations or individuals reached.

B5. Were the following types of information included in the dissemination material?

	Yes	No
a. project objectives	☐	☐
b. description of target audience	☐	☐
c. program operations and services delivered	☐	☐
d. expected project effects	☐	☐
e. staffing requirements including position descriptions and qualifications necessary for filling these positions	☐	☐
f. training requirements for staff, teachers, and others	☐	☐
g. required facilities	☐	☐
h. required materials	☐	☐
i. expected operating costs and per pupil costs	☐	☐

B6. What other information did you include in your dissemination materials that you feel is useful to organizations to facilitate replication of the program?

B7. What efforts have been made toward institutionalization? Discuss any efforts that may have been made from initial project planning through the last phase of federal funding to ensure program longevity, e.g. alternate sources of funding, infusion into the curriculum, inservice teacher training, etc.

SECTION C. FINAL ACCEPTABLE EVIDENCE

C1. Is the program being continued in the host site?

☐ Yes (If yes, answer Questions C1.1 to C1.3.)

☐ No (If no, answer Question C1.4)

C1.1 At what level is the program being continued?

☐ Low (Some components of the program are being continued.)

☐ Moderate (Approximately half of the components are being continued.)

☐ High (All of the components are being continued.)

C1.2 Which components are being continued? Have any significant changes been made in these components? Explain.

C1.3 Is the outcome/impact of the continued program being evaluated in terms of its influence on the target population?

☐ Yes, evaluation has been completed. (Answer questions in Block A.)

☐ Yes, evaluation is currently taking place or is in the planning stage. (Answer questions in Block B.)

☐ No, and there are no plans for evaluation. (Answer questions in Block C.)

BLOCK A

(a) What criteria were used to evaluate the outcome/impact of the program on the target population?

(b) Were any standards set to judge the success of the program in terms of its impact on the target population?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, what were they?

If not, why not? Could there have been? Explain.

(c) Briefly describe the evaluation methodology or plan.

1. What data were collected and by whom?

2. Were pre-/post-test measures used?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, explain.

BLOCK A continues .....

BLOCK A (con't)

If not, why not? Could there have been? Explain.

3. Was a comparison group used?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, explain.

If not, why not? Could there have been? Explain.

(d) What were the findings?

BLOCK B

(a) What criteria are being or will be used to evaluate the outcome/impact of the program on the target population?

(b) Are any standards being set to judge the success of the program in terms of its impact on the target population?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, what are they?

If not, why not? Could there be? Explain.

(c) Briefly describe the evaluation methodology or plan.

1. What data are being or will be collected and by whom?

2. Are or will pre-/post-test measures be used?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, explain.

BLOCK B continues .....

BLOCK B (con't)

If not, why not? Could there be? Explain.

3. Is or will a comparison group be used?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, explain.

If not, why not? Could there be? If so, how?

BLOCK C

(a) Why isn't the program being evaluated? Is funding a problem?

(b) Is evaluation feasible? (Explore the possibilities with the respondent in terms of meeting the criteria set forth in the monograph by asking the following questions):

1. What criteria could be used to evaluate the outcome/impact of the program on the target population?

2. What standards of success could be set?

3. What evaluation methodology could be used? What data should be collected? Who could collect these data?

Could pre-/post-test measures and comparison groups be used?

C1.4 Why wasn't the program continued in the host site? Was funding a problem?

C2. How many schools, school districts or other organizations that you know of have adapted the program?

C3. What are the names, addresses, and contact persons at these organizations?

C4. Is a follow-up of demonstration project participants being done to assess the long-term impact of the program?

- ☐ Yes, and follow-up has been completed. (Answer questions in Block A.)
- ☐ Yes, follow-up is currently taking place or is in the planning stage. (Answer questions in Block B.)
- ☐ No, and there are no plans for follow-up. (Answer questions in Block C.)

BLOCK A

(a) Who funded the follow-up data collection and analysis?

(b) What criteria were used for the follow-up to evaluate the long-term impact of the program on the target population?

(c) Were any standards set to judge the success of the program in terms of its long-term impact on the target population?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, what were they?

If not, why not? Could there have been? Explain.

(d) Briefly describe the follow-up methodology or plan.

1. What data were collected and by whom?

BLOCK A continues .....

BLOCK A (con't)

2. Is or will a comparison group be followed-up also?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, explain.

If not, why not? Could there have been? Explain.

(d) What were the findings?

BLOCK B

(a) Who is funding the follow-up data collection and analysis?

(b) What criteria are being or will be used to evaluate the long-term impact of the program on the target population?

(c) Are any standards being set to judge the success of the program in terms of its long-term impact on the target population?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, what are they?

If not, why not? Could there be? If so, how?

(d) Briefly describe the methodology or plan.

1. What data are being or will be collected and by whom?

BLOCK B continues.....

BLOCK 5 (con't)

2. Is or will a comparison group be followed-up also?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, explain.

If not, why not? Could there be? Explain.

BLOCK C

(a) Why isn't there a follow-up study? Is funding a problem?

(b) Is a follow-up study feasible? (Explore the possibilities with the evaluator in terms of meeting the criteria set forth in the monograph by asking the following questions):

1. What criteria could be used in a follow-up study to evaluate the long-term impact of the demonstration project on the target group? What standards of success could be set?

2. What data could be collected? Who could collect the data?

3. What follow-up methodology could be used? (Explore the feasibility of follow-up on both participant and comparison groups.)

SECTION D. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

This section compiles data on the roles of project planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators during the planning, implementation, and demonstration/ dissemination phases of the project. Planners are those persons who develop the detailed procedures for the project some of which may have been outlined in the proposal. Implementers refer to the staff who operates the project and includes the project director. Monitors are LEA, SEA, and USOE officials who ensure the project proposal objectives, budget, etc. are being followed. Evaluators refer to project and non-project personnel who assess the effectiveness of the project while disseminators are project, LEA, SEA, or other personnel who provide information about the project or train personnel from potentially adapting sites.

Planning Phase

The planning phase refers to the stage during which procedures for implementing the project are formulated. It begins at the inception of an idea for the project, includes preparation of the proposal, and continues after the granting of federal funding as more detailed strategies are developed. The following questions relate to this phase.

D1. Were any project staff members, monitors, evaluators, or disseminators involved in the development of the proposal?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, who were they and how were they involved? Did their involvement contribute to project success? Explain.

D2. Did any other persons contribute to the development of the proposal?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, tell who they were and how they contributed. Did their involvement contribute to project success? Explain.

D3. Was any support or encouragement given for submitting the proposal by the SEA, LEA, or host institution?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, did this contribute to project success? Explain.

D4. There are a number of things that we have found in the literature that are related to project success and improved impact in the planning stage. We would like to discuss these things with you and talk about if and how they contributed to the success of your project? For each of the items, we would like to know: (1) whether or not this was done in the planning of your project; (2) if it was, do you think it contributed to the success of the project and in what ways it contributed to success; (3) who were involved in the planning of each of these and what were their roles; (4) if it wasn't done, do you think it would have been helpful in achieving success and, if so, how?

a. Stating project objectives in clearly defined and measurable terms.

b. Stating the expected impact of the project on the target population as a primary objective.

c. Specifying required activities for accomplishing each objective.

d. Specifying timelines for the implementation of activities and achievement of project milestones.

e. Allowing for adequate time and effort for planning and sufficient time for start-up.

f. Identifying a project director who has management capabilities as well as subject matter expertise.

g. Developing a staffing plan which includes job descriptions, responsibilities, and required qualifications for each position.

h. Planning for adequate support and training of project staff, teachers, and other appropriate personnel.

i. Planning to include teachers and others who will be affected by the program in the development of project products and materials.

j. Developing a recordkeeping plan including designing project forms for internal and external use.

k. Developing a plan for keeping cost data by: (1) per pupil and total activity costs; (2) direct and indirect costs; and (3) fixed/variable costs.

l. Stating dissemination as a project objective.

m. Developing a dissemination plan.

n. Developing a formative evaluation plan as a management tool.

o. Planning for the formative evaluation to be conducted by a third-party.

p. Developing an outcome/impact evaluation plan.

q. Planning for the outcome/impact evaluation to be conducted by a third-party.

r. Planning for program longevity or institutionalization.

s. Planning for program transportability (i.e., flexibility for adaption in other settings.)

D5. Were there any other accomplishments in the planning stage not previously covered that contributed to the project's success?

If so, what were these accomplishments? Who were involved? What were their roles?

D6. Based on your experience, what additional things could have been accomplished during the planning phase that would have improved the project's success and ultimate impact? What would you have done differently?

Implementation Phase

Now we would like to ask you some questions about the implementation phase. This phase covers the time during which the project is operational.

D7. We are interested in any changes that may have occurred between what was planned and what was actually implemented. For each of the following items, please tell us if any changes occurred. If changes were made, then tell us: (1) what the changes were; (2) why they were made; (3) who was involved; and (4) whether and how these changes contributed to the project's success.

a. Project objectives.

b. Staffing and management.

c. Staff training.

d. Project operations or services.

e. Recordkeeping.

f. Fiscal matters.

g. Formative evaluation.

h. Outcome/impact evaluation.

i. Work toward program longevity or institutionalization.

j. Dissemination plan.

D8. Was any support or encouragement given to the project during the implementation phase by the USOE, SEA, LEA, host institution, or others which contributed to its success?

If so, explain.

D9. Were there any accomplishments in the implementation stage not previously covered that contributed to the project's success?

If so, what were these accomplishments? Who were involved? What were their roles?

D10. Based on your experience, what additional things could have been accomplished during the implementation phase that would have improved the project's success and ultimate impact? What would you have done differently?

Demonstration/Dissemination Phase

The demonstration/dissemination phase refers to the stage during which the project is open for observation by potential adapters and project practices and products are being disseminated for replication. The following questions are related to that stage.

D11. Were there any changes in the original dissemination plan once demonstration and dissemination began? If there were changes, what were they? Why were they made? Who was involved? Do you think these changed improved the diffusion process? If so, how?

D12. What demonstration and dissemination strategies do you think were the most effective in influencing potential adapters?

D13. Was any support or encouragement given to the project during the demonstration/dissemination phase by the USOE, SEA, LEA, host institution, or others which contributed to the success of the diffusion process? If so, explain.

D14. Were there any accomplishments in the demonstration/dissemination stage not previously covered that contributed to the project's success?

If so, what were these accomplishments? Who were involved? What were their roles?

D15. Based on your experience, what additional things could have been accomplished during the demonstration/implementation phase that would have improved diffusion and adaption? What would you have done differently?

Project Overview

D16. Looking back over the life of the project, we would like to know about any significant contributions the planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, or disseminators made to the success of the project that we may have missed.

a. First let's discuss the role of the planners and their contribution. Did the planners make any significant contributions to the project's success? If so, what were they and how did they affect the project's success?

b. What about the implementers? Did they make any significant contributions? If so, what were they and how did they affect the project's success?

c. Did the monitors make any significant contributions? If so, what were they and how did they affect the project's success?

d. Did the evaluators do anything that contributed significantly? If so, what were these contributions and how did they affect the project's success?

e. Finally, did the disseminators make any significant contributions? If so, what were these and how did they affect the project's success?

D17. As you know, projects can be funded for various lengths of time, e.g. one year, three years, five years. Regarding your project, what do you think would be the ideal funding time for each of the three phase -- planning, implementation, and demonstration/dissemination -- that would optimize the project's impact and why?

D18. Do you have any opinions regarding alternative funding times for the three phases other types of vocational education demonstration projects that would improve their impact? If so, tell what they are and why you think they would improve the projects' impact.

THIRD PARTY EVALUATOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

NAME OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT: _____

NAME OF RESPONDENTS: _____ DATE: _____

TITLE: _____ OFFICE PHONE: _____ (area code)

NAME OF ORGANIZATION: _____

ADDRESS: _____

1. Did the third-party evaluation include:

A formative evaluation	An outcome/impact evaluation	Both a formative and outcome/impact evaluation
☐	☐	☐

2. Were there any limitations placed on the third-party evaluation due to constraints imposed by the project, the LEA, the SEA, or others, e.g. not being brought on board early enough to collect the necessary baseline data or select comparison groups; not enough time to design and implement the evaluation plan; lack of access to necessary data sources; etc.

Yes	No
☐	☐

If so, explain.

3. If you had unlimited resources, would you have conducted the evaluation any differently than you did?

Yes	No
☐	☐

If so, explain.

4. We would like your opinion on the feasibility of some of the impact criteria selected for inclusion in the monograph as measures of effectiveness for this project. After I read and explain each criterion, please tell me if it has been used to evaluate this project. If it has not, could it be and how?

   A. Demonstration Impact refers to the immediate impact of the project on the target group(s). Documentation for this criterion are primary outcome measures from the demonstration site(s). Standards for judging the project's success are based on significant positive primary outcomes which can be attributed to project intervention and may require the use of such things as pretest-posttest and comparison groups.

   B. Long-term Impact refers to the long-term impact of the program on project participants. Documentation requires follow up of project participants. Standards are based on significant positive effects which can be attributed to project intervention and may require follow-up of a comparison group.

   C. Continuation/Adaption Impact is defined as the extent of impact on the target group(s) from continuing and adapting sites. Documentation for this criterion are primary outcome measures from continuing and adapting sites. Again, standards are based on positive primary outcomes which can be attributed to project intervention and may require pretest-posttest measures and comparison groups.

5. Are there any particular contributions the third-party evaluation and/or the persons involved in it made to the success of the project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, explain.

6. From your experience in evaluating the program, could you list some of the characteristics of the project that particularly led to its success?

7. Are there any additional things that could have been accomplished or could have been done differently that would have improved the project's impact?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, explain.

8. As you know, projects can be funded for various lengths of time, e.g. one year, three years, five years. Regarding the _____ project, what do
(name of demonstration)
you think would be the ideal funding time for optimizing the project's impact and why?

9. Do you have any opinions regarding alternative funding times for other types of vocational education demonstration projects that would improve their impact?

Yes	No
☐	☐

If so, tell what they are and why you think they would improve the project's impact.

PROJECT MONITOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

NAME OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT: _____

NAME OF RESPONDENTS: _____ DATE: _____

TITLE: _____ OFFICE PHONE: _____ (area code)

NAME OF ORGANIZATION: _____

ADDRESS: _____

We are interested in three phases of demonstration projects -- the planning phase, the implementation phase, and the demonstration/dissemination phase. The planning phase refers to the stage during which procedures for implementing the project are formulated. It begins at the inception of an idea for the project, includes preparation of the proposal, and continues after the granting of federal funding as more detailed strategies are developed. The implementation phase covers the time during which the project is operational while the demonstration/dissemination phase refers to the stage during which the project is open for observation by potential adapters and project practices and products are being disseminated for replication. These phases refer to activities rather than time periods. Although they run consecutively, they do overlap each other. Some of questions below refer to these project phases.

1. Did you or your organization have a role in the planning of the project, including the development of the proposal?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, what was it?

2. Can you think of any outstanding things that took place during the planning phase of the project that contributed to its success?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, what were they? How did they contribute to the project's success? Who was involved?

3. Was this project an outgrowth of another ongoing project in the same LEA or SEA?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, explain.

4. Were there any features about the implementation phase of the project that you think particularly contributed to its success?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, what were they? How did they contribute to the success of the project? Who was involved?

5. Were there any outstanding features about the demonstration/dissemination phase that improved the chances of the program being adapted at other sites?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, what were they? How did they contribute to the success of the project? Who was involved?

6. Were any actions before or during the federal grant period taken by you, the project staff, or others that increased the chances of the program being continued and/or institutionalized?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, what were they? How did they contribute to the success of the project? Who was involved?

7. In the monograph, we will be discussing the roles that the planners, implementers, evaluators, monitors, and disseminators play in the success of the project. Planners are those persons who develop the detailed procedures for the project some of which may have been outlined in the proposal. Implementers refer to the staff who operates the project and includes the project director. Monitors are LEA, SEA, and USOE officials who oversee the project. Evaluators refer to project and non-project personnel who assess the effectiveness of the project while disseminators are project, LEA, SEA, or other personnel who provide information about the project or train personnel from potentially adapting sites.

Looking back over the grant period of _____ project,
(name of demonstration)
were there any significant contributions made to the success of the project by the planners, implementers, evaluators, disseminators, or yourself as monitor that contributed to the success of the project that we may have missed?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, what were they? How did they contribute to the success of the project? Who was involved?

8. Based on your experience, are there any additional things that could have been accomplished during the life of the project that would have improved its impact?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, what are they? How could they have contributed to the success of the project?

9. Are there any things that you think should have been done differently that would have improved the impact of the project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, what are they? How do you think they would have improved the project's impact?

10. As you know, projects can be funded for various lengths of time, e.g. one year, three years, five years.

Regarding the _____ project, what do you think
(name of demonstration)
would be the ideal funding time for each of the three phases -- planning, implementation, demonstration/ dissemination -- that would optimize the project's impact and why?

11. Do you have any opinions regarding alterantive funding times for the three phases for other types of vocational education demonstration projects that would improve their impact?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, what are they and why you think they would improve the project's impact?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR ADAPTING ORGANIZATIONS

IDENTIFICATION DATA

DATE: _____

NAME OF RESPONDENT: _____

TITLE: _____ Office Tel: (Area Code) _____

NAME OF ORGANIZATION: _____

ADDRESS: _____

_____

OPENING

My name is _____ and I'm from Development Associates, Inc., a research firm located in Arlington, Virginia. We have a contract with the United States Office of Education to develop a monograph which addresses the measurement and improvement of the impact of vocational education demonstration projects.

We understand from _____ (source of referral)

that you adapted the _____ (name of demonstration)

program in your school (or other setting). We would like to ask you some questions about your program to assist us in validating the monograph. As you may know, the Educational Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94-482) requires that demonstration grants shall not be made "unless the applicant can demonstrate a reasonable probability that such grant will result in improved teaching techniques or curriculum materials that will be used in a substantial number of classrooms or other teaching situations within five years after the termination date of such grant." Our study has been funded by U.S.O.E. in response to this mandate to develop criteria and standards which will measure the impact of demonstration projects. One of the things we are particularly interested in is the spread of these demonstrations and this is why I have contacted you. Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation will enable us to make the monograph we are developing more complete.

1. How did you learn about the (name of demonstration) program in _____(location)_____ (e.g. a newsletter, conference, your RCU director, etc.)?

2. Describe the process which led to the adaption including key decisions to actually use the program.

3. At what level did you adapt the program?

   ____ Low (Some components of the program were adapted.)

   ____ Moderate (Approximately half of the components were adapted.)

   ____ High (All of the components were adapted.)

4. What components were adapted? Briefly describe each.

5. What are the specific objectives of your program?

6. How long has your program been operating?

7. How many persons have been exposed to the program to date?
In how many classrooms, schools, etc., has it been implemented?

8. Would you have implemented more components of the program or expanded its use if you had received more support from your school, school district, state education agency, etc? Explain.

9. Has there been an outcome/impact evaluation of the program in terms of its influence on the target population?

___ Yes, the evaluation has been completed. (Answer questions in Block A.)

___ Yes, evaluation is currently taking place or is in the planning stage. (Answer questions in Block B.)

___ No, and there are no plans for evaluation. (Answer questions in Block C.)

BLOCK A

(a) Who funded the evaluation?

(b) What criteria were used to evaluate the success of the project? What standards of success were set?

(c) What data were collected? Who collected these data?

(d) Briefly describe the evaluation methodology or plan.(Probe for information on use of pre-/post-tests and comparison groups.)

(e) What were the findings?

BLOCK B

(a) Who is funding or will fund the evaluation?

(b) What criteria are being or will be used to evaluate the success of the program? What standards of success have been or will be set?

(c) What data are being or will be collected? Who is collecting or will collect these data?

(d) Briefly describe the evaluation methodology or plan. (Probe for information on use of pre-/post-tests and comparison groups.)

BLOCK C

(a) Why isn't the program being evaluated? Is funding a problem?

(b) Is evaluation feasible? (Explore the possibilities with the respondent by asking the following questions:

1. What criteria could be used to evaluate the success of the program? What standards of success could be set?

2. What data could be collected? Who could collect these data?

3. What methodology could be used? (Explore feasibility of pre-/post-measures and comparison groups.)

10. What additional information or assistance could you have used from the demonstration project or other disseminators which would have helped you in implementing the program?

11. What dissemination strategies used by the demonstration program were the most effective in influencing you to adapt the program?

12. What other dissemination strategies do you think would have been effective in influencing you to adapt or to increase spread elsewhere?

That's all the questions I have. Do you have any further comments? Thank you very much for your help.